



South Mountain Corridor Study Citizens Advisory Team Meeting Summary

Date: April 6, 2006
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: District 6 Komatke Center, Learning Center Meeting Hall

CAT Members Attending:

Rock Argabright, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce
Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee
Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA
Steve Boschen, Valley Forward
Jim Buster, Avondale
Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee
Doris French, Laveen Village Planning Committee

Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council
Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce
Bob Moss, United Dairymen of Arizona
Nathaniel Percharo, I-10 Pecos Landowners
Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development
John D. Rodriguez, Lakewood HOA
Jim Strogon, Kyrene de los Lagos Elementary School

Staff and Consultants:

Emily Bittner, PDG
Matt Burdick, ADOT
Mike Bruder, ADOT
Kelly Cairo, GCI
Chris Clary-Lemon, HDR

Ken Davis, FHWA
Amy Edwards, HDR
Dave Edwards, ADOT
Theresa Gunn, GCI
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Don Herp, COP

Heather Honsberger, HDR
Dean Howard, PDG
Dan Lance, ADOT
Roger Roy, MAG
Ben Spargo, HDR
Bill Vachon, FHWA

Citizens:

William Eastburn
David Folts
Jim Jochim
James LaSalvia
Jerome LaSalvia

Jerry Leavitt
Peter Lesio
Matthew Alan Lord
Doug Murphy
Lisa Percharo

Corinne Purtill
William Richardson
Brian Schumacher
Dave Swisher

ACTION PLAN

Task/Activity	Who	When
Add comments received during presentations to smaller groups, such as homebuilder associations and the Sierra Club to the Public Comment Report.	Theresa Gunn	Prior to 4- 27 CAT mtg.
<i>Impact matrix additions:</i> Add number employees that would be impacted to the matrix; consider whether political individuals and boards can effectively be captured to include in political acceptability; consider whether number of respondents can be represented in public comment; Correct shading on page 2 to reflect that the top line is only W55; and, the W101 information actually applies to W101 and W71.	Amy Edwards	Prior to 4- 27 CAT mtg.

Information to be sent to CAT in next packet includes: corrected impact matrix; Q/A from other public meetings; video flyover on DVD; I-10 projected traffic count at Chandler, Pecos traffic numbers; and, public questions received at this meeting.	Amy Edwards and Theresa Gunn	Prior to 4- 27 CAT mtg.
--	------------------------------	-------------------------

Welcome

Theresa Gunn welcomed attendees and encouraged members of the public to review the Citizen Advisory Team handout, which includes a question and comment form. She asked CAT members if they would like any of the questions from the public as received at the March 30, 2006 meeting added to the agenda. Questions included:

- Who authored i.e. group or company the VISSIM Software for the microsimulation traffic flows shown at the 3/30/06 SMCAT meeting? Did a branch of government or department pay a company to develop this software?
Response: VISSIM is the latest simulation package used around the country. It's development was partially financed through the federal government, a university in Florida, and ITE, the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: Can you show what happens to the traffic if a freeway is shut down due to an accident using the traffic demand model? **Response:** The software could be used to do so, but this is not typically part of the DEIS.

Question: Did VISSIM show that some travel times are better with the no-build option?

Response: No, the models did not show this. Additionally, it was the MAG travel demand model that showed travel times. This is also the industry model and is used around the country.

Project Update

Amy Edwards addressed a CAT question from the previous meeting as follows:

- What is the status of 51st Avenue if something other than the W55 alternative is selected? **Response:** The City of Phoenix is waiting to see about the results of this study. If an option other than W55 is selected, COP plans to reevaluate this area.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: What is the status of the elevations for the Pecos area? **Response:** We are still looking at profile variations along South Mountain.

Draft Technical Report Summaries

Cost Estimate Reports

Cost estimate information provided to the CAT included three reports as follows:

1. Draft Construction Cost Estimate – This is a revised report. As noted throughout this study process, information is updated regularly and construction costs are among those changes.

2. Draft Right-of-Way Estimate – This is a new report and will be reviewed in detail.
3. Draft Cost Estimate – This report totals the two previously noted reports and will also be reviewed.

Draft Right-of-Way Report and Draft Cost Estimate Report

Ben Spargo presented the Draft Right-of-Way Estimate and Draft Cost Estimate reports. Dave Edwards reviewed the definition of highest and best use for purposes of appraisal or in this case estimation and answered specific ADOT right-of-way questions. Presentation highlights included:

- Right-of-way (ROW) costs include acquisition, relocation, and demolition of affected properties.
- ROW costs are determined using the highest and best use of the property.
- Appraisers have the responsibility to see that property appraisal meets the specified tests and that it receives appraisal at the highest and best use.
- The court can issue a condemnation order to obtain a property and money will be awarded to the property owner. Litigation, however, does not stop a project.
- Parcel type is based on county assessor records.
- Land shown as vacant is estimated based upon the highest and best use, which may be either residential or commercial.
- E1 extends to west of 51st Avenue between Elliot and Estrella.
- There is potential for change in costs as the study progresses.
- Costs are updated each six months.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: What about farmland that would likely be converted to residential soon?

Response: This would probably be considered residential. A similar consideration would be given to a corner that is currently farmland that would likely be rezoned commercial, given area trends.

Question: What is ADOT's involvement with the Real Estate Commission? **Response:** ADOT does not participate in the Real Estate Commission. We don't give real estate advice, and would never advise anyone regarding real estate contracts.

Comment: It is difficult to receive reports at the meeting during which the reports will be reviewed. **Response:** This is why we are having both presentation time and significant discussion time allotted to the topic. However, draft construction costs were distributed several months ago.

Question: Residential displacements previously did not include some of the new developments at the western end of Pecos Road. Does it now? **Response:** We used updated information from the Maricopa County Assessors office that included properties platted as of December of 2005.

Comment: I have heard that there are properties at the end of Pecos that are in escrow with ADOT.

Comment: There should be asterisks near costs explaining items such as "no hazardous materials present." It seems that there are additional costs that are still missing.

Response: At this point, we don't have the list of contingencies defined. The contingency costs are comparable across all of the build alternatives.

Question: What about the wells? **Response:** They are currently part of the utilities cost, but are not itemized.

Question: Who is the appraiser and how are appraisals made? **Response:** The state is bound by codes regarding fee appraisers. There is a pre-approved list of perhaps 50 individuals used by various state agencies. Data acquired for this report was not full appraisals, but estimations.

Question: What about variation in appraisals by different appraisers? **Response:** When time to acquire properties, ADOT will order multiple appraisals on higher value properties. There also is a review appraisal process. The information we have now is just an estimate to be used for these reports and does not bind any individual property to an amount.

Question: Is the name of the appraiser available? **Response:** Appraisers are obligated to contact each property owner when conducting the purchase price appraisal. This would be done if a build alternative were selected and property acquisition initiated.

Comment: The City of Phoenix just gave me a higher value on a piece of property than shown in the original appraisal. I feel confident in the ADOT appraisal process due to this personal experience.

Comment: Land prospectors in Laveen are hiding under an agriculture zoning, but I don't see that listed on the chart. **Response:** We show either commercial or vacant land in this area. Estimates were made based on highest and best use which is what would happen during the appraisal process for acquisition.

Question: Is South Mountain part of E1 vacant land? **Response:** We are not sure of the designation of the park on this type of chart. We need to hold off on E1 questions until we hold east side meetings.

Question: In Table 4 where a vacant parcel is shown, is the actual zoning in place?

Response: Vacant parcels are shown at the future best use. Some figures reflect a blend of commercial and residential uses in the future.

Comment: So this project would represent half of the \$5 billion dollar freeway budget?

Response: No, the freeway portion of Prop 400 you are referring to is \$9 billion dollars, half of which comes from the sales tax extension.

Comment: W55 is the shortest route, so it is not surprising that it is also the least expensive. **Response:** Correct.

Question: What does relocation of commercial properties include? **Response:** This includes items such as reestablishment expenses and is included in these ROW estimates shown here.

Comment: It would have been nice to see relocation costs broken out from other commercial ROW costs.

Comment: Sometimes there are relocation issues between the owner and the lessee.

Response: The property occupant receives relocation expenses.

Question: Will we know who the appraisers are? Is this information in the full report? Is just one appraiser used? **Response:** It is up to ADOT as to whether this information can be presented. The appraiser used to develop the study level estimates has 20 years experience with ADOT and has served as an expert witness in the past. There is a strenuous approval process to get on the list of appraisers that ADOT uses, and a team of consultants and staff make the determination.

Question: Have we exhausted the conversation about a totally depressed freeway on E1? **Response:** The Pecos area is still under study and there will be more options to ADOT for their consideration within about three weeks.

Question: If there is a freeway on Gila River Indian Community land, are the rules of appraising different? **Response:** The same appraisal rules apply, including looking at the highest and best use. However, ADOT does not have condemnation rights on GRIC.

Question: What if the appraiser is not well-informed? **Response:** There are appraisers who specialize in public and private lands.

Draft Public Comment Report

Theresa Gunn reviewed the Draft Public Comment Report. Presentation highlights included:

- Public scoping meetings began in November of 2001.
- Since that time, the project team has conducted more than 200 meetings or presentations, with more than 4,000 attendees, and more than 4,500 comments have been received to date.
- The Public Comment Report presented includes information from November of 2005 through February of 2006. An addendum to this report is forthcoming.
- This report is to be considered qualitative, not quantitative, and is not statistically defensible.
- People who provided comments on the study are self-selected, and therefore cannot be considered a representative sampling.
- Typically, those who lived near a freeway alignment did not support it. However, those who were within the study area did support a freeway.
- Of the questions asked on the comment form, two separate questions included:
 - Do you support or oppose building a South Mountain Freeway?
 - Which location do you prefer?
- Surveys distributed through Councilman Lingner's Office are not included in these counts, and have not been forwarded to the study team.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: Are comments from meetings included in the counts? **Response:** We did not assume that attendees were representing the ZIP code in which the meeting was held. Comment forms offered a space for ZIP code information, and that information was used to categorize the comments instead of by meeting.

Question: Why include comments from people outside the study area. **Response:** Anyone who submitted a comment form is included in the report. (A CAT member also noted that these people are affected by congestion in this area and would be affected by a South Mountain Freeway.)

Comment: The comments from presentations to smaller groups, such as homebuilder associations and the Sierra Club should be part of this report. **Response:** We will add this information to the report.

Comment: It is interesting that the people at the November meeting in Avondale made comments different than what the Avondale elected officials are saying. It appears that the elected officials don't represent the people.

Comment: The coalition that supports W55 includes John Williams and family. On Tuesday, he was elected president of SRP.

Question: What about the Ahwatukee information? **Response:** Because we are focusing on the west side. The Ahwatukee information is in the report. There was a very small response from the Ahwatukee ZIP codes regarding west side alternatives, with just a few comments from the 85044 ZIP code.

Comment: The Southwest Valley Chamber includes more than 900 members, and all of the members support W55 in a recent poll. **Response:** Please forward the information. We haven't received any petitions of this nature.

Impact Matrix

Amy Edwards presented the Impact Matrix, which is a summary of project reports to date. She reviewed any areas that changed since the corresponding original report was presented to the CAT. Members of the CAT were asked to thoroughly review this information, and to contact Amy Edwards, Mike Bruder, or Mark Hollowell with any questions prior to the April 27, 2006 meeting. The impact matrix will be available on the project website at www.SouthMountainFreeway.com on April 7. Presentation highlights included:

- All technical report summaries are included. Updates have been made where changes have occurred and information reflecting CAT member requests has been added where possible.
- As additional changes occur, the information will be updated for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- The quick view tool is meant to show a comparison of the options in that row only. It is not designed to compare between rows.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: I would like to see the number employees that would be impacted as part of the matrix. **Response:** We will add this information and get it out to everyone.

Question: Are positives and negatives represented universally? **Response:** We did not attempt to interpret what would be considered positive or negative.

Question: Can you add the scale, such as "acres," to the quick view? **Response:** In each instance, the actual values and labels are included in the table.

Question: Is the bottom line of the quick view always "0?" **Response:** Yes.

Comment: Political acceptability only includes city responses, but not people like J.D. Hayworth, Stanton, and the Parks Board. **Response:** We will consider whether we can

capture this information effectively and add it to the matrix. We have used official city council actions to this point.

Comment: The city bar chart doesn't make sense. **Response:** This is an error. The chart information on page 9 will be removed, because this information cannot be quantified.

Comment: There are only 70 respondents from the NE/NW Valley areas, but the chart doesn't provide context of how many responded. You should add the number of respondents. This may also be confusing to the public, who hasn't necessarily reviewed the draft reports from which this information has been pulled. **Response:** We will review this issue.

Question: The shading on page 2 is confusing. **Response:** We will correct this information to show that the top line is only W55; and, the W101 information actually applies to W101 and W71.

Question: How can the W55 option be the least expensive considering the commercial relocations? **Response:** In this case, the type of business being relocated affects the cost.

Comment: The commercial appraisal values look very politically motivated. **Response:** Those who did the estimates had no idea what the politics were. The values look high in some areas because any property designated commercial, including vacant land, is included in the cost. The figures do not represent just the existing businesses.

Question: On page two, in the third row from the bottom, is this reflecting actual businesses? **Response:** Yes, for displacement costs. However, ROW includes the actual businesses plus future best and highest use figures.

Question: Does the detailed cost information include a business-by-business report? **Response:** Yes, this is in the full report.

Comment: I would like to see the video flyover. **Response:** We will mail all CAT members a copy of the DVD.

Comment: I would like to see the update from July 2004 on the detailed truck classification. When will we have this? How was the data generated? The numbers don't seem to add up. I also want the I-10/Chandler projected traffic counts. **Response:** We will provide the I-10 traffic count at Chandler in the next packet.

Comment: I think the MAG presentation showing 10 percent of traffic on U.S. 60 and South Mountain would be truck traffic is unrealistic.

Comment: We are basically a hub from Long Beach, and therefore I have doubts about the truck numbers we have received.

Evaluation Criteria

Gunn explained that the CAT should review the criteria statements and determine if each is understandable, whether the statements are parallel, and whether in a 1-9 rating situation, a rating of "9" would be the equivalent of "best."

CAT members reviewed all statements and concurred that all should remain as stated with one exception. The project cost statement was changed and agreed to, as follows:

Cost should be a consideration: total cost of constructing the freeway is assessed with the gains and losses to the affected communities.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: E1 should not be included as part of the west side evaluation.

Question: How will we represent the W101 options in the evaluation? **Response:** (Note: Following discussion, all CAT members agreed that W101 would be considered as a whole, and the group would evaluate three alternatives. There were no dissenting opinions. However, should the CAT prefer the W101 following their evaluation, some members would like to ask ADOT to consider the value of certain implications that differ between the options.)

Comment: I suggest that we do not make any criteria changes on April 27th.

Comment: I would like to see a respiratory therapist speak to the group. **Response:** More information is coming on air quality issues and will be included during E1 discussion.

Comment: We don't have air quality information as a baseline for comparison.

Question: What level of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} do we expect to ingest over the next 20 years if we live 250 feet from a freeway? What about the level of cancer increase to be expected within a half-mile from the freeway? The level of chemicals ingested? The level of diesel chemicals that would be excreted in our urine? **Response:** (A CAT member asked if anybody can answer these questions.) **Reply:** Yes, a respiratory therapist can address these issues. However, we have lost our Sierra Club representative who would have access to these types of individuals.

Comment: In the West Valley, particularly in Laveen, a freeway would help improve local air quality by moving vehicles off extremely congested arterial streets and onto a faster-moving freeway.

Comment: I would also like to receive the Pecos traffic numbers. **Response:** We will include this information in the next packet as well.

Evaluation Meeting

Gunn reviewed meeting expectations for the April 27th evaluation meeting as follows:

- ADOT and FHWA will not sit at the table.
- The first half hour will be discussion time for CAT members.
- Each criterion will be compared to every other criterion, in a random match.
- Each of the three alternatives will be rated for each criterion.
- Results will be provided, and the group can determine if they wish to reevaluate the alternatives and/or create a statement for ADOT.
- Members of the media and a large number of public attendees may be present.
- CAT members should bring sample language regarding what they would like to include in a letter to ADOT that would accompany the recommendation.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: I can't believe we will not be addressing no-build as one of the options in the evaluation. **Response:** CAT members explained that this had previously been discussed,

and that if there was a GRIC option at some point in the future, it might affect whether no-build would be selected when looking at the western section alternatives.

Comment: The CAT is just one component of what ADOT will review in making its determination of preferred alternative.

Question: What about CAT members who have not been attending meetings? **Response:** Most CAT members have been attending regularly, other than a few of the Tribal members.

Comment: I don't believe the MAG numbers were an accurate representation of our beliefs, which was implied in the news articles. This shows me that there are major land use planning problems in Maricopa County. **Response:** These types of points would be appropriate to include in the letter to ADOT.

Comment: Any statement written that evening would be rushed and a disservice to the project. I suggest we write the statement another day. **Response:** This is an option, and we will consider that option on April 27.

Comment: I want to urge John Rodriguez to continue to pressure ADOT for air quality information.

Written Comments/Questions Submitted by the Public:

Comments and questions received during the meeting are recorded here verbatim from forms received.

Dave Swisher, Mountain Park Community Church

When a church is in the right away and cannot be relocated to an existing facility, how is the purchase, construction and relocation handled by ADOT?

David Folts, Concerned Families Along South Mountain Loop 202

1. Can ADOT state the name and number of the law that they have quoted where ADOT or another governmental body has 18 months to decide when to purchase real estate identified in the South Mountain Loop ADOT right-of-way zone?
2. An ADOT relocation expert (Dave) stated that they have used one company/person for the last 20 years for appraisal values. Why is this, are his reports of higher quality, is this a process that goes out to bid or quoted on?
3. Under Public Comment Summary, a rep from Gunn Communications stated that questions or comments submitted were taken from respondents with a Tolleson ZIP code. What happened to the questions asked by the public who had ZIP codes outside Tolleson who attended these meetings?
4. During ADOT's final review, you showed how the Draft Criteria would be shown in pairs i.e. (noise reduction) vs. (overall cost of highway). Why not just let the SMCAT members assign a value of each criteria individually?
5. Under Public Comments, if a person who attended one of the meetings shown under the Public Comment Presentation submitted five questions/comments either for or against the proposed highway would that be counted as five pro or con highway?

6. Is there a minimum distance a highway can be constructed to a home? Please use the shoulder of a planned highway when giving measurements for any policies, rules or laws that exist for the above question.
7. How close has ADOT constructed a highway to a home in the past that it has not purchased, condemned?
8. If the costs were deemed too high to acquire the additional property/real estate shown, is the right-of-way zones shown on ADOT November '05 meetings. Would ADOT then abandon these plans and then just build a two or three lane highway regardless of how near structures (homes) are to this proposed highway?

CAT Member Comment Cards:

Statements shown below are recorded verbatim from comment cards:

- Add political statements from all political concerns – persons – organizations.
- Any quantitative statements should be accompanied with raw number as well as percent.
- Separate relocation costs from ROW cost estimates on construction cost estimate.
- What is ROW costs for South Mountain Park?
- DVD on flyovers please.
- Add number of employees lost with business.

Adjourn

Next CAT Meeting

The next CAT meeting will be held Thursday, April 27, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. at the Learning Center Meeting Hall, Komatke Center, in District Six.